



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/708,532

03/10/2004

Kevin M. Jensen

146887

2531

23413 7590 10/10/2008  
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP  
20 Church Street  
22nd Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2455

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/10/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/708,532	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JENSEN, KEVIN M.	
	<b>Examiner</b> OANH DUONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/01/2007 and 02/25/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 15, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seraphin, US 2004/0177127 A1, in view of Franco et al. ("Franco"), US 6,687,745 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Seraphin teaches a method for managing computer memory in a networked system (abstract), comprising:

determining when a first web page is being closed or a second web page is being opened on a first computer (*i.e.*, "if the user selects the logout button on any of the pages received," page 3 paragraph [0033]), the first web page having an embedded software object (*i.e.*, removal object) therein (*i.e.*, removal object may be received as an object reference within a web page, page 2 paragraph [0023]); and,

in response to the first web page being closed or the second web page being opened, executing a software function in the embedded object that releases memory in the first computer associated with the embedded software object (*i.e.*, when a logout

Art Unit: 2155

*page (or second page) is received at the browser, a function call in the HTML code for the logout page activates the removal object to selectively remove the sensitive data in the cache, page 3 paragraph [0033]).*

Seraphin does not explicitly transmit a first data message to a second computer instructing the second computer to stop sending predetermined information to the embedded software object.

Franco, in the same field of endeavor, teaches transmit a first data message to a second computer instructing the second computer to stop sending predetermined information to the embedded software object in response to the first page being closed or the second page being opened (i.e., message including a termination session command is transmitted to the server when the web page containing the droplet-enabled application is closed or the user navigates to another page, col. 13 lines 49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Seraphin to transmit a first data message to a second computer instructing the second computer to stop sending predetermined information to the embedded software object in response to the first page being closed or the second page being opened as taught by Franco because it was conventionally employed in the art to allow communication session to be terminated in response to web page being closed or a user navigating to another page.

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 7, this claim recites a method that is substantially the same as a method claim 1, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 8, this claim comprises a network system for performing a method claim 1, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 17, this claim comprises a networked system for performing a method claim 1, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 5, 15, and 22, Seraphin teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the released memory of the first computer is RAM (page 3 paragraph [0033]).

4. Claims 2-4, 9-11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seraphin, US 2004/0177127 A1, in view of Franco et al. ("Franco"), US 6,687,745 B1 , and Kuwata et al. ("Kuwata"), US 2005/0071464 A1.

Regarding claims 2, 9, and 19, Seraphin teaches the method of claim 1.

The combination of teachings of Seraphin and Franco does not teach transmitting a second data message from the second computer to a third computer instructing the third computer to stop send to the second computer the predetermined information utilized by the embedded object of the first computer, in response to the computer receiving the first data message.

Kuwata teaches transmitting a second data message (i.e., a request to invalidate the session) from the second computer (i.e., controller 11) to a third computer (i.e., server 112) instructing the third computer to stop sending to the second computer the predetermined information utilized by the embedded object of the first computer, in response to the computer receiving the first data message (Fig. 1 page 2 paragraphs [0022]-[025]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination of teachings of Seraphin and Franco to transmit a second data message from the second computer to a third computer in response to the computer receiving the first data message as taught by Kuwata. One would be motivated to do so to enable session for web-based application to be terminated and resources allocated to the session to be reclaimed.

Regarding claims 3, and 10, Seraphin-Franco-Kuwata teaches the method of claim 2 further comprising releasing memory in the second computer allocated for both first communication session with the third computer and for storing the predetermined information received from the third computer (i.e., Kuwata, page 2 paragraph [0022]).

Regarding claims 4, and 11, Seraphin-Franco-Kuwata teaches the method of claim 2 wherein the third computer receives the second data message and releases memory allocated in the third computer for both the first communication session with the

Art Unit: 2155

second computer and for storing the predetermined information received from a sensor (i.e., Kuwata, page 2 paragraph [0022]).

5. Claims 6, 12-14, 16, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seraphin, US 2004/0177127 A1, in view of Franco et al. ("Franco"), US 6,687,745 B1, and Schlereth, 2004/0205197 A1 .

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Seraphin teaches the method of claim 1.

The combination of teachings of Seraphin and Franco does not explicitly teaches the first data message includes an information identifier that identifies a predetermined measurement value or a predetermined status value received by the second computer.

Schlereth teaches data message includes an information identifier that identifies a predetermined measurement value or a predetermined status value received by the second computer (page 2 paragraphs [0021]-[0026]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination of teachings Seraphin and Franco to include a predetermined measurement value or a predetermined status value as taught by Schlereth because it was conventionally employed in the art to identify the current sensor measurement values.

Regarding claims 12-14, those claims recite limitations that are substantially the same as claim 6, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 16, Seraphin-Franco-Schlereth teaches the networked system of claim 8 wherein the embedded software object is configured to display the predetermined information on the first web page (i.e., Schlereth, page 2 paragraph [0030]).

Regarding claim 20, Seraphin-Franco-Schlereth teaches the networked system of claim 19 wherein the third computer determines the predetermined information from a measurement signal generated by a sensor communicating the third computer, the measurement signal being indicative of an operating parameter of a device (Schlereth, page 2 paragraph [0022]).

Regarding claim 21, Seraphin-Franco-Schlereth teaches the networked system of claim 19 wherein the third computer determines the predetermined information from a status signal generated by a sensor communicating the third computer, the status signal being indicative of an operating status of a device (Schlereth, page 2 paragraph [0022]).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OANH DUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 9:30PM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Oanh Duong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455